

Application No. 10/577,666

Docket No. R2184.0492/P492

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 (all the independent claims) have been amended. Claims 1-11 remain in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications. A Petition for an extension of time is being filed concurrently herewith. Please charge any deficiency in the fees associated with these papers to Deposit Account 04-1073.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Devore. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. The claims have been further amended to obviate the rejection. The Office Action contends that Devore includes a sense transistor 18 that includes sense transistors 38, 40, 42, 44 connected in parallel. Even if that is the case, however, the semiconductor chip 25 not only has sense transistors formed at a peripheral portion thereof but also has a sense transistor 46 formed at a center portion. The Devore arrangement of sense transistors is markedly different from that of the presently claimed invention, which has no transistor formed at a center portion of the area of the semiconductor chip. Because the claimed invention has no transistor formed on the center portion of the area of the semiconductor chip, an even heat distribution can be obtained.

According to claim 1, as amended, the center portion of the area of the semiconductor chip on which the driver transistor is formed has no transistor formed thereon:

... plural transistors are disposed at a periphery of an area of the semiconductor chip on which the driver transistor is mounted, such that the plural transistors are located around a center portion of the area ... and are not located in the center portion ... such that the monitor transistor is not located in the center portion ... and ... the center portion of the area of the semiconductor chip has no transistor formed thereon.

Devore fails to disclose or suggest this important aspect of claim 1, as amended. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.


Application No. 10/577,666

Docket No. R2184.0492/P492

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1, or recite limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claims 2-11 should be allowable along with claim 1 and for other reasons.

Dated: February 28, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mark J. Thronson
Registration No. 33,082
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
202-420-4742

Attorneys for Applicants